

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/988,783

Applicant(s)

PREVOST, JEAN

Examiner

Wendy Boss

Art Unit

1775

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Wendy Boss/Deborah Jones.

(3) Jean Prevost.

(2) Matt Shanley.

(4) Joe Muncy/Robert Mitchell.

Date of Interview: 21 November 2002 .

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____ .

Claim(s) discussed: _____ .

Identification of prior art discussed: U.S. 4,396,653 (Tomarin), U.S. 5,794,861 (Rutherford), U.S. 4,337,283 (Haas, Jr.)

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet .

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Regarding anticipation rejection over Tomarin, applicant proposes amending claim 13 to read "substantially $2/3$ " rather than "at least $2/3$ " since the Tomarin particulate material is higher than $2/3$ the length of the ribbons. Regarding obviousness rejection over Haas, in view of Rutherford, applicant argues that one would not have recognized advantages of using cryogenically ground rubber and therefore would not have been motivated to use this type of rubber in the Haas invention. Regarding the 112, 2nd paragraph rejection, applicant proposes amending formula in claim 22 to read $2A=3/2T=L$. Regarding Double Patenting rejection, applicant argues that this should be an obviousness-type rejection rather than statutory, and will submit a terminal disclaimer with response. Arguments will be further considered upon formal submission. Applicant will also be submitting IDS for CA 2095158, which was cited on IDS of parent application.